



en

MS AMENDMENT
PATENT
3782-0183P

IN THE U.S. PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Linus WIEBE et al. Conf.: 9785
Appl. No.: 09/746,506 Group: 2673
Filed: December 22, 2000 Examiner: L. SHAPIRO
For: GENERAL INFORMATION MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW

MS AMENDMENT
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

June 16, 2005

Sir:

Pursuant to MPEP § 713.04, Applicants submit the following with regard to the personal interview conducted on May 31, 2005, and the subsequent telephonic interview conducted on June 2, 2005.

During the interview, Applicants argued that *Silver* fails to cure the deficiencies of the teachings of *Hecht* for the reasons set forth in Applicant's Reply filed May 26, 2005.

Applicants further argued that *Hecht* fails to teach or suggest "a position-coding pattern which codes absolute coordinates of a total set of positions, wherein one or more subsets of said position-coding pattern is provided on said base, **wherein the total set of positions coded by the position-coding pattern specifies unique positions on an area greater than any practicably useable base.**"


Hecht discloses in col. 4, lines 28-31, suitably, the glyphs 22 and 23 are printed by a printer (not shown) operating at 300 d.p.i.-600 d.p.i. to write 4 pixel x 4 pixel or 7 pixel x 7 pixel representations of the glyphs 22 and 23 on regularly spaced center. *Hecht* further discloses that each address code sequence is a fifteen-bit sequence (col. 13, lines 44-45). As such, the coding scheme of *Hecht* is too inefficient to anticipate claim 1, as, to the best of applicants knowledge, the largest area *Hecht* discloses may be approximately 64 feet x 64 feet, which is not greater than any practicably useable base, as required by the claim. As such, Applicants maintain that neither of the references, either alone or in combination, teach nor suggest all of the claim elements and, as such, it is respectfully requested that the outstanding rejection be withdrawn.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By


Michael K. Mutter, #29,680

6
MKM/CMV/mmi
3782-0183P

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000